

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

John Philip Compton, # 129830,

Plaintiff,

-versus-

Larry W. Powers, Director of Spartanburg County
Detention Center,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 4:08-2405-TLW-TER

ORDER

The Plaintiff has brought this *pro se* action against the Defendant under Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. Defendant filed a motion for summary judgement and supporting memorandum on December 19, 2008. (Doc. # 25). Pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the Plaintiff was advised by Order filed December 22, 2009, of the summary judgment dismissal procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond to the motion. (Doc. # 26). The Plaintiff filed his response to Defendant's motion for summary judgment on January 22, 2009. (Doc. # 28).

This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that the Defendant's motion for summary judgement be granted in its entirety. The Plaintiff has filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 31).

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 29); Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 31); and Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. # 25).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten

TERRY L. WOOTEN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

August 11, 2009

Florence, South Carolina